Publishing in political science journals

Alasdair Blaira[a], Fiona Buckley[b], Ekaterina Rashkova[c] and Daniel Stockemer[d]

[a] Faculty of Business and Law, De Montfort University, Leicester, UK

Email: ablair@dmu.ac.uk

[b] Department of Government and Politics, University College Cork, Cork, Ireland

Email: f.buckley@ucc.ie

[c] Public Governance and Management, Utrecht University School of Governance, Utrecht, The Netherlands

Email: E.Rashkova@uu.nl

[d] School of Political Studies, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada

Email: dstockem@uottawa.ca

Abstract

Publication in academic journals is a critical part of the academic career. However, writing academic papers and getting them published is not a straightforward task. This article seeks to provide editors' insights into the process of publishing by outlining common factors that lead to papers being rejected as well as charting strategies that ensure papers have the best chance of being sent out for review. The article discusses the important issue of peer review, including how best to respond to reviews and the expected academic conventions in terms of acting as reviewers.

Keywords academic articles • desk rejection • peer review • referee reports • political science

Introduction

In broad terms the period since the end of the Cold War in 1991 has witnessed a dramatic expansion in higher education around the world. The growing number of linkages between universities and professional associations across the globe reflects this trend. Political science is no exception. Professional associations such as the International Studies Association (ISA), the American Political Science Association (APSA) and the European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR) have a global reach, with their annual conferences attracting participants from around the globe. Apart from the importance of networking, academics attend conferences to test their ideas through the presentation of research papers and to learn from others.

These are responsibilities that are core to the remit of *European Political Science* (EPS), given its role as the ECPR's professional journal. As editors we have a particular focus on ensuring that the journal reaches out to a wide audience. This includes trying to safeguard that submissions come from a diverse group of scholars, taking into consideration such issues as gender and geography. While EPS attracts a wide range of submissions given its broad focus, a distinguishing feature of the journal is its focus on the profession. Notable examples include articles that have dealt with such matters as the training of doctoral students (Thorlakson, 2005; Mair, 2009; Mycock, 2007; Tonge, 2005), the role of graduate teaching assistants (Barr and Wright, 2019), providing advice to new entrants to the profession (Jenne, 2009; Rhodes, 2006; Ștefuriuc, 2009; Thorlakson, 2009), the discussion of incentives for publication (Gleditsch, 2007), the role of professional associations (Brintnall and Mealy, 2014; Craig, 2014; Pleschová, 2014), the professionalisation of the discipline (Daalder, 2010; Goldsmith and Goldsmith, 2010; Mény, 2010), broader debates about the future of the discipline (Flinders, 2018) and highlighting the gender gap in publications (Deschouwer, 2020; Grossman, 2020; Stockemer et al., 2020).

Despite this wider professional scholarship, the journal has given far less attention to the challenges of crafting academic writing. A number of the above articles make fleeting reference to the importance of publication (e.g. Mair, 2009) and offering specific advice such as 'don't accumulate stacks of unpublished conference papers' (Thorlakson, 2009: 164). Notable exceptions include the two articles that Keith Dowding wrote in EPS on publishing in academic journals (Dowding, 2003a and 2003b). In the first one, Dowding initially explained the benefits of writing articles, the type of journals to publish in, and the review process (Dowding, 2003a). The second article went into more detail with regard to expected success rates for publishing, the reality of receiving rejection letters, as well as publishing tactics in

terms of writing with other scholars (Dowding, 2003b). In the subsequent two decades, EPS as well as other journals have not really covered the publishing process or academic writing more broadly. Richard Rose is one of the few scholars who has sought to shed light on the craft of academic writing, covering such issues as the practicalities of academic writing in his own memoir (Rose, 1997 and 2013), the benefits of writing a book (Rose, 2010) and how to give advice to politicians in a time-constrained environment (Rose, 2008).

The relative lack of attention to journal writing may not seem so surprising to some scholars who consider it a 'given' that colleagues understand how to write an article, learning as they progress with their studies and receiving advice from supervisors, mentors and working with others. Yet at the same time, it is still the case that a considerable number of colleagues are not research-active. In addition, the expansion of the academy at a global level has brought in colleagues from countries where there is less awareness and understanding of the norms and conventions of academic writing that tend to be centred on Western models of teaching and learning. This is a particular challenge for journals such as EPS that are on the one hand keen to widen its readership and authorship, yet often receive articles that do not meet many of the basic academic requirements and are, therefore, desk rejected.

It is with these wider developments in mind that this article seeks to contribute to the profession through its focus on academic journal publishing. The article does not provide a magic approach to publishing that leads to a guaranteed acceptance. Rather, we base it on the premise that there are some basic approaches that scholars and students of political science can take to improve the chance of acceptance. The information that we set out is quite straightforward and many colleagues would regard it as common sense. The article proceeds as follows. First, we identify the factors that influence the decisions taken with regard to the rejection of articles. Second, we comment on how to respond to referee reports. Third, we note ways to move on from a rejection decision. Fourth, we offer some advice about how to improve the chance of publication. Finally, we proceed to explore possible avenues of writing that scholars may pursue.

Rejection

As with Dowding (2003b), we start our initial focus with the process of dealing with rejection by peer review. Articles in this category fall into two categories. The first are the articles that are desk-rejected by the editors and the second are those that are rejected after the review

process. In the first instance, editors' base decisions on desk rejections by the overall quality of the article and the fit and relevance of the article to the journal. Every journal will receive a number of articles that are just not relevant to its readership. For a journal such as EPS this might include the likes of country studies that fall outside of the European geographical arena and which provide findings that have little impact on European affairs. Such articles are often of a speculative nature and tend not to be written for the journal's readership. Other desk rejections include those articles that present a sense of being rushed, such as work that has been quickly drawn from a Ph.D. thesis or a research project that has little relevance to the journal. We also desk reject many articles because they are methodologically weak, have some substantive weaknesses such as a thin case study, or where the arguments are confused and unclear. Other notable reasons for desk rejections include articles that make claims that are over-substantiated and which are not supported by appropriate evidence.

Although the majority of desk rejections are because the article does not fit the journal or have the appropriate level of quality, it may occasionally be the case that editors encourage authors to resubmit their work because there are some underlying positives to it. In this case, we invite the authors to 'correct' some basic flaws before resubmission for peer review. In general terms, decisions on desk rejection are not that difficult for editors as it is normally quite clear why an article does not have the required quality threshold or fit the journal's remit. For the most part, this is often reflected in a tendency of scholars to submit more speculative work where there appears to be little or no understanding of the journal's aims and what the journal has previously published.

The practicalities of the review process influence desk rejections where there is no point in sending out articles for review that are of a poor quality or which do not fit with the journal's focus. This is reflective of the fact that it can sometimes take up to 20 requests to find suitable reviewers. And while this can be an extreme situation, journals are regularly faced with asking up to 10 reviewers before they get the required number of reviews. As the editors of the journal *Politics* wrote in their 2013 editorial: 'Rejecting these articles at an initial stage removes from the reviewing pool papers whose current states of under-development make it highly unlikely that they will be positively reviewed. We believe this has two virtues: on the one hand it means authors have a constructive, not negative, encounter with the editorial process despite their paper being underdeveloped; on the other, it allows peer reviewers to focus on papers that have a realistic chance of publication' (Editorial, 2013: 1).

Articles that the editors have decided to send out for review normally come back with three recommendations: accept, revise and resubmit, and reject. It is extremely rare for articles to come back from reviewers to journal editors with just 'publish' on the review form; in fact, this possibility is not something that we have experienced during our period as editors. The most common recommendation is revise and resubmit with suggestions for change falling into the categories of minor and major amendments. Minor changes can vary from such small matters as adding/deleting a paragraph to clarifying data on a table. In the majority of these circumstances, the editors can take the decision to publish after the author has implemented the changes. In such situations, it is generally straightforward for the editors to understand the nature of the implemented changes. It is standard for an article with a decision for major revisions to go through a further review to ensure that the authors have made the necessary changes to the article to the reviewers' satisfaction. During the revision process we try to help authors by providing guidance to authors on the core areas that they need to focus on.

Formatted: Indent: First line: 1.27 cm

Referee reports tend to come in a variety of shapes and sizes. The very best often extend to two pages and provide an overview of the strengths and weaknesses of the article as well as a more detailed account of areas that require change. Good referees tend to number their comments, which in turn assist us as editors and in the end the authors by being able to provide more focused comments on the areas that require change. Referees may also offer a separate cover note to the editors. Diligent referees take this as a serious bit of business, in particular, if they want to communicate something to the editors, which they cannot mention in the review. This can range from making the weaknesses of the article clear to the editors, indicating any conflict of interest they might have to an indication that they have already reviewed the same article for a previous journal. More commonly, however, such notes to editors strike a balance between the potential of the article to be published and the expected level of work that their revisions require.

Although in general terms there is often a degree of unanimity among the reviewers in terms of the quality (or not) of the article, on occasion there is the need to go out to an additional reviewer and/or take an editorial decision on where to proceed with the article if there is division between the reviewers. This is likely to be less of a concern for top-tier journals such as the *American Political Science Review* (APSR) and the *British Journal of Political Science* (BJPS) where articles are only likely to proceed where all referees are in favour of publication (albeit with revisions). In the case EPS, editorial decisions about whether to progress or not are taken on a consensus basis. In some instances, this extends to the use of 'editorial prerogative';

this is, in rare occasions we will take a decision to progress with an article that is against the recommendations of one of the referees. Such situations reflect the need to strike a particularly delicate balance between going against referee judgements (and therefore annoying a referee) and the identification that an article has something innovative to offer. We do not take such decisions lightly, but as other editors have noted, they do happen (c.f. Richardson, 2007:17).

The nature of the journal can strongly influence the decision of journal editors to proceed with an article with mixed reviews. Broad-based journals such as the APSR and BJPS often receive more than 1000 submissions a year. They normally only allow for a revise and resubmit if all reviews are positive. More specialized journals such as ours, but also journals such as *Acta Politica* that receive 100 or 200 submissions (or fewer) a year, will be more likely to go with a revise and resubmit decision, even more so if the editors like the piece. The nature of the journal will influence not only the level of submissions, but also the quality of papers. And while junior scholars often hear the advice to aim high for top-tier journals, not least for the benefits of the reviews that they receive, we want to caution against this general strategy. If your article is not making a general theoretical contribution to the literature of political science or to the literature in one of the subfields of political science, journal editors of such top journals will likely desk-reject the article, even more so, considering that many reviewers increase the bar of recommending a revise and resubmit for a top journal.

In crude terms, editors have to be mindful of the demands of sending articles out to review that are unlikely to be published in the journal, even more so because it can be quite difficult to get colleagues to undertake reviews. To take an example, an editor of EPS receives upwards of 60 review requests a year, and accepts upwards of 40. Early career, non-tenured academics, on the other hand face multiple challenges for career progression and reviewing, not being recognized by tenure-granting bodies, is quite low on this list. There is an attempt by *Publons* – a database of performed reviews – to change this onerous practice, but, for the moment, it remains at its infancy.

As a rule of thumb for a journal such as EPS, approximately one-third of the articles that have been sent out for review will be rejected (in addition to the one third of desk-rejects). So, let us summarize, when we reject articles: A main reason is that reviewers make it clear that the article does not make a sufficiently new contribution and/or that it has a number of significant weaknesses. Some rejections also have the added frustration that a reviewer will have previously commented on the article for another journal and the revised article has not

taken on board any of their recommendations. In such circumstances, the reviewers normally make it clear to the editors in a separate note that they have seen the piece before and explain the decisions behind their recommendation. Finally, as editors we have to make a judgement about the required level of changes and the demands of going back out to reviewers again in the event of a resubmission, of which some reviewers may have noted that they may not wish to review a revised article. If the reviews point to significant weaknesses in the article that cannot or are hard to fix, a reject decision is the logical consequence. Taken together, these factors are therefore likely to influence the decision not to progress any further with the article after review.

To recap, the factors that influence decisions on rejections include, but are not limited to: (1) the article not being relevant to the journal; (2) the article in itself not really being an article in terms of the content, focus and contribution to the discipline; (3) a lack of context to the article – for example in political science there is a general trend that articles set out the context of the literature and the contribution to the discipline; (4) the absence of methods and/or the presence of poor methods; (5) the lack of theory; (6) the lack of a sufficiently detailed empirical analysis; (7) the article not being of the correct length, e.g. too short or too long; (8) poorly written such as in terms of style, grammar, conventions, and absence of proof reading. The latter is, however, less of a deal-breaker as journals often have assistance that they can draw upon in terms of English language editing if the article meets the requirements for publishing.

Dealing with referee reports

The nature of the human condition means that scholars are likely to be a little piqued when they receive the comments from referees asking them to make changes to academic papers that they will have already spent a considerable amount of time working on. While it might not be the first thing on your mind, scholars should hopefully receive these comments with an element of gratitude as the feedback from the referees should improve the quality of their work. The peer review process and ethical standards means that editors should not publish an article that ignores referee comments (although as noted in the previous section, editors can, on rare occasions, use their editorial prerogative to pursue publication when faced with mixed reviews). It is important that authors take on board the comments that the referees provided and take the necessary time to make changes to the paper. While the editors could expect a

paper requiring changes of the most minor nature to be completed in a relatively short space of time such as a couple of weeks, other changes are likely to take longer. It is best not to rush the revisions process by completing the process in a few days or a week as this is likely to create a sense of suspicion on the part of the editors that you have not really made the necessary changes to the paper. It is also more than likely going to lead to another round of correspondence identifying changes that are still required as it is unlikely that you will have spent enough time considering the areas identified as needing improvement. After you have made the necessary adjustments to your paper, such as the collection of new data or the refinement of your arguments, you should outline the changes that you have made in a detailed cover letter – the so-called rebuttal. A good rebuttal should set out in detail the changes that you have made, such as noting the insertion or deletion of new material, and link these changes to the recommendations made by reviewers. Response letters can run to a number of pages and editors generally prefer to have this sort of detailed information as it provides reassurance that you have taken the review process seriously.

It is likely that there will be some comments from the referees that you have not fully agreed with, or have been unable to make the necessary changes. For example, it might not be possible to collect additional data. You should outline the reasons why you cannot make such changes in the response letter. It goes without saying that resubmitted papers should conform to the house style of the journal. While journals would obviously prefer all articles at the point of submission to follow the house style, most editors show some leeway when it comes to stylistic requirements at the initial submission stage. However, once an article has undergone peer-review and when the editors asked for a resubmission, it is important that you follow the journal house style. Finally, it can occasionally be the case that a relatively small number of articles are rejected after resubmission. Thankfully given the time invested by the author(s), the referees and the editors, these are rare occasions (at least for our journal). When these types of rejections happen in our journal, the reasons for these include authors not responding to a decision, the absence of a sufficiently detailed rebuttal explaining the changes that have been made, and a lack of attention to referee comments in the revision.

Where to go next after a rejection

Receiving letters of rejection is part and parcel of academic life. In fact, the most published scholars are probably also the ones who received the highest number of rejections. It is

therefore better to get used to them at an early stage of your career. In the case of desk rejected articles based on quality grounds, it is important to consider the reasons for this decision given that you will not have the benefit of a referee report. It may be important that you consider strategies that enable you to gain additional feedback on your work, such as contacting colleagues, mentors and supervisors. This might then lead you to presenting your work again at conferences and at workshops. Desk rejected articles usually have significant flaws or are simply not a good match with the remit of the journal; it is important to take time to redevelop your work. If it is the case that the article just does not fit the remit of the journal, then the editors would have made this clear in their response letter. In this case, you might decide to send your article to another journal. However, you have to assure yourself that the journal you are sending your article to now, is actually a good fit (something you might have neglected when you first submitted your piece).

Rejections after review require a bit of time to reflect on the feedback that you have received. While facing criticism is never easy, the worst thing you can do is to do nothing. The feedback should be invaluable in terms of developing your article, of which you should develop a revised article with another journal in mind. While it might be the case that some scholars can get away with just sending their article back out on the rebound, there will probably be tell-tale signs that the article has been written for a different journal such as house style. Moreover, as the work might end up with the same reviewer, this rarely results in a positive outcome. It is better to take the feedback on board and develop your work. This might also involve reaching out to additional co-authors to develop a particular angle of the article, such as method or theory. This can have the added benefit of widening your research contacts and increasing the likelihood of publication.

What editors would like!

Having outlined the factors that generally account for articles being rejected and the process of peer review, we now offer some advice which may improve your overall chance of success in terms of publication. The first, and in many ways most obvious point, is to think about the journal that you wish to submit your article to. For example, EPS is unlikely to accept articles that have a specific focus on political theory or elections in Africa. So please do not send these types of articles to us. However, you might want to consider whether there is a debate that you can engage with in the journal. At one extreme this could include taking a position against an

article that has already been published in the journal, such as the response by Ante Buche, Jonas Buche and Markus Siewart (2016) to Daniel Stockemer's (2013) criticism of fuzzy set analysis as a weak method for studying women's representation in parliament, to which Stockemer then subsequently responded to Buche et al. (Stockemer, 2016). If there is a benefit to this game of cat and mouse, it is to raise a level of debate around an issue, which is of course the fundamental point of what we are trying to do as academics. And while such debates may continue in the setting of academic conferences, in the end there is probably only so much of this that can be played out in the pages of an academic journal.

Other writing opportunities include the development of existing work published in the journal. The latter does, however, come with a word of caution; journal editors might come to a view that the journal is being saturated with a particular type of article; this, in turn, may influence them to take a decision of a desk reject. In such circumstances the editors would let the authors know that the reason for rejection is about achieving an appropriate balance of coverage in the journal. Yet, just as it is useful to look at what has been published in a journal, it is also useful to consider what has not been published as this can identify writing opportunities. With all of these points, a key issue is thinking about whether what you have to say is of relevance or importance to that particular journal and its readership. Would you want to read it?

Just as it is important to locate your work within the context of the journal, so too it is important to consider the journal's house style. This is more than just considering such technical aspects as the placing (or not) of a colon before the page number in a reference. And while it would obviously be nice if all authors paid attention to such minutiae, some of the bigger issues include the extent to which the article meets the required word length. All journals are subject to publishing contracts that stipulate pagination and adherence to word length is therefore important in terms of keeping the journal on track. It is also important to ensure consistency in the type of article that the journal publishes. If the journal has a 4,000 or 8,000 word limit, it is important to follow this.

Articles that you submit to journals should have already received feedback and have been developed as a result of presentation at conferences and workshops. Giving your research this sort of exposure will help to refine your arguments and mean that potential reviewers are more likely to have come across your arguments. Wherever possible it is important to get as much feedback on your work as possible. This is helpful in terms of clarifying your arguments

as well as more basic points such as the way that the work is presented and laid out. Most articles can be edited and while you might have spent a long time finding a quote or data for a table, if it does not help the article, then it is best left on the cutting room floor.

Just as you should have taken time to revise and develop your article over a period of time, it is also important not to forget the inclusion of a clear cover letter. The letter should make it clear what the article is attempting to argue, its relevance to the journal and why it should be published. Some recognition of the methods and/or theories that the article employs can be helpful. It might be stating the obvious, but it is helpful to stress why a particular journal is a good place to publish your work. You should also give consideration in the cover letter to how the article links to other work published in the journal (or not) as well as raising such points as highlighting how the article addresses a topic or area that are within the journal's remit and which the journal has not published on recently. If the article is particularly timely then it is worth stressing this in the covering letter given that many journals will already have articles ready for the next 12 months. By stressing the timeliness of the work, you are also raising a flag to the editors that if the article is accepted for publication, consideration might be given for earlier publication as opposed to just taking its place in the normal publication queue. Finally, it is no harm to include names of potential referees who would be well-placed to review your work as this can be useful in terms of aiding the editors' task of finding suitable referees. You should not view this, however, as a sign of currying favour or trying to get undue influence in the decision-making process.

Writing opportunities

Politics is the gift that keeps on giving for students of political science. Whether that be the constant churn of the election clock or global crises, there is plenty of material to write about. Keeping a fresh and open mind is important. Just because a journal has not published an article on a topic or area that you have an interest in writing on, does not mean that you should discount the journal as a place to publish. Nevertheless, you should consider whether the article is within the journal's remit. This could involve some early engagement with editors, such as in terms of scoping out potential ideas that they might be interested in. There is of course no guarantee to publication, but it does open up a line of communication that can be helpful in assisting with the publication process and in clarifying your thoughts as whether to proceed or not in terms of writing the article for *that* journal. It might seem strange to consider that you are writing for

a journal, but just as Ph.D. theses rarely make good books, so do random articles make a good fit with any journal. Some journals, including EPS, publish symposiums or a collection of articles that are proposed to the journal by an author. Such an endeavour can be helpful for both the authors and the editors as it can bring together the output of a group of scholars on a core theme, such as from a conference and a roundtable. Such articles do not come with a guarantee of publication and will still be subject to peer review. In some instances, this can result in some difficult correspondence with the lead author(s) of the symposium where an article does not make the grade for publication. If editors think that a particular topic is of strong relevance for the journal, they can also commission articles. For some more specialised journals, commissioning articles can also be useful for editors in terms of securing content.

Being clear about what you are writing and what the journal is looking for is, therefore, an important first step in the writing process. While journals such as EPS have a wide range of subject coverage, other journals such as *Political Theory* are clearly more specialised and focused. And given that there has been a considerable expansion in the number of academic journals that are available to publish in, it is important to think about where your work is more likely to be read given that academics do not have the time to spend browsing through all journals. Journals of the main professional associations such as APSA, ECPR, and PSA have the benefit of having a broad reach to their respective membership, but for more specialist topics such as European foreign policy, scholars might be better to consider the likes of *European Foreign Affairs Review* (EFAR) or the *Journal of European Public Policy* (JEPP). As a general rule of thumb, it is good practice to have a writing strategy that targets a range of journals. You should consider strong research pieces for the likes of top journals, while more state of the discipline or review articles might have a better home elsewhere. While some journals can often be open to pieces that survey a discipline or a debate, including for example literature reviews or meta analyses, others are less likely to be interested in these pieces. In the world of metrics and impact factors, review articles and meta-analyses can have an obvious attraction and importance, because of their superior potential of attracting citations.

Conclusion: scholars and editors dilemmas

Scholars and editors face a similar dilemma in terms of the need for publications. The pressure for academics to get their papers out is reflected in a culture of ‘publish or perish’ that is considerably different from the environment of two or three decades ago (c.f. Mair, 2009). The

importance of metrics and citations in terms of obtaining academic promotion reflects this focus. A direct impact of this is papers are submitted to journals that are not quite ready for publication. Fundamentally, it is important to consider the significance and importance of what you have to write about as it needs to be of interest. This requires striking a balance between those papers that need working on for a considerable period of time and others which may be completed more quickly, whether that be book chapters or state of the discipline pieces. You also need to consider the research methods that you employ. It is therefore important to consider having a publication strategy that includes working and writing with other scholars. This is important in terms of gaining feedback that develops the papers more swiftly and robustly, as well as having a group of scholars who can work together on a number of papers at any one time. As this group approach is more akin to the sciences where research teams write together in a way that is not so apparent in the social sciences, it is therefore important to try to cultivate the networks that will enable you to be part of such a network. This might also involve considering those aspects of your work that you are less confident in. Thus, if you are less strong at the sort of advanced quantitative methods that appear to be increasingly in vogue in such journals as *APSR*, but you nonetheless are an expert in the likes of democratic transition, one strategy would therefore be to work with a colleague in your own discipline or in a related discipline who could rectify this deficit.

Just as academics face the need to publish, so too do editors. Editors are normally appointed for a specific period of time by the journal and usually submit annual reports detailing publishing output. This is more than just the need to secure content. Rather, it is about developing the reputation of the journal, such as by improving its impact factor. Good editors are therefore keen to get out and about to meet potential authors at conferences. A good publication strategy should therefore involve thinking strategically about where to publish and also thinking about colleagues that you can write with to develop your work. If such a strategy leads to more publications, then well done. But if the strategy also means that you are always being successful with the articles that you are submitting then you should also have a rethink. The likelihood is that you are being too safe or conservative with the journals that you are targeting or not being ambitious enough with your research. Thus, although rejection should be something that all scholars experience, it is just a question of how much!

References

Barr, M. and Wright, P. (2019) 'Training graduate teaching assistants: What can the discipline offer?', *European Political Science* 18(1): 143–156.

Brintnall, M. and Mealy, K. (2014) 'Advancing Teaching and Learning in Political Science: The Role of the American Political Science Association', *European Political Science* 13(2): 159–170.

Buche, A., Buche, J. and Siewert, M. (2016) Fuzzy logic or fuzzy application? A response to Stockemer's 'fuzzy set or fuzzy logic?', *European Political Science* 15(3): 359–378.

Craig, J. (2014) 'Supporting Political Science Education in UK Universities: The Role of the PSA Teaching and Learning Group', *European Political Science* 13(2): 146–158.

Daalder, H. (2010) 'Political Science in Europe and the ECPR: Looking back and Looking on', *European Political Science* 9(S): 30–37.

Deschouwer, K. (2020) 'Reducing gender inequalities in ECPR publications', *European Political Science* https://doi.org/10.1057/s41304-020-00249-y

Dowding, K. (2003a) 'Getting published in academic journals: advice to doctoral students and young academics (part one)', *European Political Science* 2(2): 63-70.

Dowding, K. (2003b) Getting published in academic journals: advice to doctoral students and young academics (part two)', *European Political Science* 2(3): 63-70.

Editorial (2013) 'Politics in 2013 – The Changing Landscape of Academic Publishing', *Politics* 33(1): 1–4.

Flinders, M. (2018) 'The future of political science? The politics and management of the academic expectations gap: evidence from the UK', *European Political Science* 17(4): 587–600.

Gleditsch, N. (2007) 'Incentives to publish', *European Political Science* 6(2): 185–191.

Goldsmith, M. and Goldsmith, C. (2010) 'Teaching Political Science in Europe', *European Political Science* 9(S): 61–71.

Grossman, E. (2020) 'A gender bias in the European Journal of Political Research?' *European Political Science* https://doi.org/10.1057/s41304-020-00252-3

Jenne, E. (2009) 'Preparing for an academic career in Europe: The perspective of a North American', European Political Science 8 (2): 168–174.

Mair, P. (2009) 'The Way We Work Now', *European Political Science* 8(2): 143–150.

Mény, Y. (2010) 'Political Science as a Profession', *European Political Science* 9(S): 11–21.

Mycock, A. (2007) 'Where's the real lecturer? The experiences of doctoral educators in the UK', *European Political Science* 6(2): 203-218.

Pleschová, G. (2014) 'Promoting Political Science Education in Europe: How Can ECPR Support Their Members in Their Work As Political Science Teachers?', *European Political Science* 13(2): 138–145.

Rhodes, M. (2006) 'Young people in the political science profession', European Political Science 5 (3): 232–234

Richardson, J. (2007) 'Editing the Journal of European Public Policy', *European Political Science* 6(1): 15-19.

Rose, R. (1997) 'The Art of Writing About Politics', in H. Daalder (ed.) *Comparative European Politics: The Story of a Profession*. London: Cassell, pp.127-139.

Rose, R. (2008) 'What would you tell the President in Three Minutes About Iraq?', *European Political Science* 7(1): 78-83.

Rose, R. (2010) 'Writing a book is good for you', *European Political Science* 9(3): 417-419.

Rose, R. (2013) *Learning about Politics in Time and Space*. Colchester: ECPR Press.

Ștefuriuc, I. (2009) 'Introduction: Building an Academic Profile – Considerations for Graduate Students Embarking on an Academic Career in Political Science in Europe', *European Political Science* 8(2): 138–142.

Stockemer, D. (2013) 'Fuzzy set or fuzzy logic? Comparing the value of qualitative comparative analysis (fsQCA) versus regression analysis for the study of women's legislative representation', *European Political Science* 12(1): 86–101.

Stockemer, D. (2016) Fuzzy sets … too fuzzy to study women's representation in parliament!', *European Political Science* 15(3): 379–388 (2016).

Stockemer, D., Blair, A. and Rashkova, E. (2020) 'The distribution of authors and reviewers in EPS', *European Political Science* https://doi.org/10.1057/s41304-020-00251-4

Thorlakson, L. (2005) 'Models of Doctoral Training in European Political Science', *European Political Science* 4(1): 82-94.

Thorlakson, L. (2009) 'Collected Wisdom: Advice to New Entrants to the Profession', *European Political Science* 8(2): 162-167.

Tonge, J. (2005) 'The last bastion of ad hocery? Research supervision from idea to viva', *European Political Science* 4(2): 230-237.

About the Authors

Alasdair Blair is Jean Monnet Professor of International Relations and Associate Pro Vice-Chancellor Academic at De Montfort University. He is editor of European Political Science (EPS).

Fiona Buckley is a lecturer in the Department of Government and Politics, University College Cork (UCC), Ireland where she specialises in gender politics. She is the Books Review editor of European Political Science (EPS).

Ekaterina Rashkova is Assistant Professor at the Utrecht University School of Governance, Public Governance and Management. She is editor of European Political Science (EPS).

Daniel Stockemer is Full Professor in the School of Political Studies at the University of Ottawa. His research interests are in political participation, political representation, minority politics and populism. He is editor of European Political Science (EPS) and the International Political Science Review (IPSR).